Assignment of Amount to District Boards under Rural Development Fund.

*Q.—112. Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Rs. 84,75,927-13-5 under Rural Development Fund remained undistributed and untransferred to respective District Boards under Section 105 (1) of Act IV of 1952 since 13th January 1952;

(*b*) out of this amount the amount transferred since 1958 to any of the District Boards;

(*c*) whether they have not stated on many occasions that many of the District Board roads and other works could not be attended to due to slender financial resources of the respective District Boards ?

A.—Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Nil.

(*c*) Yes.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ 105, 106, 107ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರುವ ವರಮಾನವೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು; ಬಾಕಿ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಕಡಮೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

†Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—There is a point which I would like to clarify. These Rural Development funds no longer exist. That was closed in the year 1952-53. There was a book balance of Rs. 84 lakhs and odd in the year 1952-53. But it was not covered by security. The matter was brought before the House, the then Legislative Assembly, and they have accepted it. In the Financial Memorandum presented to the House in the year 1953-54, it has been noted like this. "There are certain reserve funds like special reserve, rural development fund, etc., which represent only book balances and have no cover in the form of security. The liquid securities in respect of these having been utilised on productive and other works in previous years, the above balances have to be treated as extinguished." There was some delay in extinguishing these heads and they have been subsequently extinguished and there are no funds available under that head. Therefore, we have not distributed any amount. On the other hand, after the extinguishing of this head, we have spent nearly Rs. 150 crores on several rural development works in the State.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು 105, 106, 107ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂದು.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am not able to say because I have not got the Act before me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ತಾವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಉಂಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಆಗ ಕಾನೂನು ನೋಡಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಾ, ಅಥವಾ ನೋಡದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—At the time first answer was given, it was not found out that the funds had been dissolved, and that the fund did not exist. By the subsequent probe into the matter we understand that the fund no longer exists and therefore we are not in a position to distribute any funds.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 105 (1)ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇರುವಾಗ, ಅದನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರೊಸಿಡಿಂಗ್ ನೋಡಿ ಅದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಆ ಫಂಡ್ ಎಕ್ಸಿಟಿಂಗ್ ಎಶ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೈಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ.—ಫಂಡ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೊಡಲೇ ಬೇಕು. ಫಂಡ್ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಫಂಡ್ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಕ್ಟೇಟಂಷಿಪ್ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಈಗ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾತ್ರ ಕೇಳಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು.

I object to the use of the word 'dictator'. After all, during question time the Hon'ble Members should ask questions and elicit information. When a proper opportunity comes, the Hon'ble Member may say anything in the matter.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—It is a question which naturally arises out of the answers.

2. P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must point out that it is not fair on the part of the

Member to have made such remarks at this stage. The Member can only elicit information.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—I rise on a point of order. Is it in order for a Member of this House to characterise the Ministry as dictatorial especially when the Government has been elected by the Members of this House itself ?

(Several Members rose and protested)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with the merits of the charge. I am only concerned as to whether a charge of this kind may be made at this stage when we have taken up questions and answers. The occasion can be utilised for eliciting information and not for making or meeting charges against the Ministry. There will be an occasion for Members to make such charges and for the Ministry to answer them.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That would be true if the Hon'ble Member was trying to make an insinuation. But in this case the Member says that what he alleges is a matter of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That cannot be so. If the Member is not satisfied with the reply, he can ask fresh supplementaries, but the question hour should not be used to make charges.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I was only questioning the attitute of the Government in this respect. Would it be in consonance with the spirit of democracy not to obey the laws ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I must answer the charge. When the matter came before the Assembly for the dissolution of this fund, this very Assembly has accepted and I cannot go against the decision of this House—though not this House, its predecessor has accepted the dissolution of this fund and we have no fund under that head to distribute.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, can a Resolution, passed by the previous House, amount to an amendment to the Statute ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether the Resolution was legal or not or whether it entails suspension of certain sections of the District Board Act, is a different question altogether and that cannot be gone into now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು 1957ರಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೇ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆ ಆ ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಡಿಸಾರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಫಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಡಿಸಾರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತೇ ಅಥವಾ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಡಿಸಾರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತೇ ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—In the Budget Memorandum of 1953-54, page 7 we find mention of certain reserves which are not covered by any liquid securities. The same thing is noted in the year 1952-53 also atpage 8. There also we find that there are certain reserve funds like Rural Development, etc, which represent only book balances and have not been covered in the form of securities. Therefore we have no money to distribute under that head and that head does not continue to be in existence.

Mr SPEAKER.—Question time is over.

QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY

(but not taken up).

Appointment of Principal of Gulbarga Teachers Training College.

**Q.*—56. Sri R. M. PATIL (Navalgund).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

whether the High Court has made an observation in its judgement that in appointing the Principal of the Gulbarga Teachers' Training College the Government acted with malice ?

A.—Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Minister for Education).—

No. The question of *mala fides* was raised on behalf of the petitioner but the High Court observed that in view of the fact that the orders are liable to be quashed on other grounds it is unnecessary to express any final opinion on this point.